

To: Rob Terry (Terry.Robert@epa.gov)[Terry.Robert@epa.gov]
From: LEE, LILY
Sent: Fri 5/27/2016 6:24:34 AM
Subject: See slides 21-24 in attached
UCSC Community Presentation on Shipyard cleanup LKN 26May2016.pptx

Dear Rob,

Based on the information we gave Lyndsey, she did some calculations and added slides 21-24 to the attached. Let's talk about these with Lyndsey Fri morning. Thanks!

- Lily

Lily Lee

Cleanup Project Manager

Superfund Division

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9

75 Hawthorne St. (SFD-8-3)

San Francisco, CA 94105

Tel: 415-947-4187, Fax: 415-947-3518

www.epa.gov/region9/superfund

From: Nguyen, Lyndsey
Sent: Thursday, May 26, 2016 10:05 PM
To: LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>
Subject: Added a few slides

I think I answered Dan Hirsch question. I ran a few to determine how he calculated his PRGs (he used 1000000m^2 , no cap, and the rest is default including climate). Then, using his parameters,

I tested out the action memo cleanup numbers from Navy and all were below 3×10^{-4} except for Th-232. If we used a realistic scenario (using 1000000m², 60cm cap, 0.001 vegetation and inhalation, San Francisco climate, and 3×10^{-4}), the allowable residual contamination was huge compared to what the Navy cleaned up to. That shows that the Navy could have gone much higher for cleanup values based on the realistic scenario of future use for the site but they chose not only acceptable cleanup values but relatively conservative numbers.

Lyndsey

Lyndsey Nguyen

Environmental Response Team-Las Vegas

Phone: 702.784.8018

Cell: 702-373-3756

Email: Nguyen.Lyndsey@EPA.gov